



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The chief merit of the book lies in the forcible manner in which its author has traced the history of this change as it was wrought out during the century between Walpole's administration and the first Reform Bill. The treatment of George III is particularly successful. By omitting details and ignoring irrelevant subjects, Professor Macy has thrown into strong relief the commanding power and position of the king. He was able to appoint, control and remove ministries, because he could always secure a majority in the Commons and because the cabinets were not units. The first ministry that was able to stand together and assert its policy was that of Earl Grey, and it did so because it was backed by the imperious demand, especially of the unrepresented part of the nation, for Parliamentary reform. At this crisis the king lost his power of appointing and removing ministers at his will and of dictating their policy, while the ministry itself became a unit under the headship of the premier. At the same time the House of Lords lost its position of equality with the Commons, and the latter definitely assumed the leadership as the mouthpiece of democracy within the nation. By this process the power of the Tudor monarch — that power which George III had come so near recovering — passed to the cabinet, and under its leadership Parliament again found its strength — and that in enhanced degree. Though the material in the book is not in all respects well arranged, Professor Macy has made a contribution to the literature of his subject which should commend itself to thoughtful students on both sides of the Atlantic.

H. L. OSGOOD.

Southern Statesmen of the Old Régime: Washington, Jefferson, Randolph, Calhoun, Stephens, Toombs and Jefferson Davis. By WILLIAM TRENT, M.A. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1897. — xv, 293 pp.

The writer of this attractive series of lectures is a Southerner "who cannot recollect ever seeing a slave, and who has never believed in the doctrine of state rights *per se*." He is one of the younger men of the South who as authors and scholars are bringing to their section a new fame and a more worthy name than that begotten in the old *régime* by the contributors to that "farrago of pathetic nonsense known as pro-slavery literature." The lectures included in this volume were delivered at Madison, Wisconsin, before an audience of students and townsmen; they are popular in form and character, without lacking dignity, accuracy, or literary finish. Their

main purpose is to sketch the lives of leading Southern statesmen before the war and to give them their proper place in our history.

The task was well worth undertaking, and for its successful accomplishment Professor Trent is in some respects peculiarly fitted. He is known as a writer of grace and vigor, having first distinguished himself by his charming book on William Gilmore Simms, the literary lion of the old *régime*. He is unusually free from cant or prejudice; his mind seems as simple and clear as the style in which he writes; and he approaches his subject with rare candor and open-mindedness. One feels constantly, as he reads, that the writer is absolutely without petty fear of Southern opinion, and quite as free from a desire to propitiate Northern sentiment. He looks at all the matters under discussion directly, and sees them face to face. As a result, we have a calm, rational account of men, some of whom have been worshiped at the South and execrated at the North: the judgments of the book are, therefore, valuable to the student of history who is desirous of reaching sensible conclusions. It may be said, too, that the book appeals to one as an indication—in itself an historical fact of no mean value—that the day has come when sober-minded men of the new South can look upon the *ante-bellum* heroes as less than demi-gods.

For the general reader or listener the lectures are well suited, and are likely to stimulate to further reading and investigation. The special student, on the other hand, regrets that Professor Trent did not seek to accomplish something more than the characterization of seven statesmen of the old South. The book would have been more valuable had he sought at all times to interpret these men as exponents of Southern thought and ideas, or had he shown us what qualities in each were the essential results of environment, the natural products of a peculiar civilization. Perhaps this is assigning him, after the fact, an impossible task; but it must be said that no one is better fitted to do it. In the lectures on Randolph, Stephens, Toombs and Davis he has in part accomplished this very thing, and these lectures are the most valuable and suggestive portions of the book.

The lecture on Washington is one more attempt, of which there have been several within a twelvemonth, to rescue the father of his country from the quicksands of mythology, under the belief that a man tempted like as we are is a more potent figure in the life of a nation than a being of whom men speak with bated breath, and whose noble example is shrouded by the halo that surrounds him.

That a strong, sober, energetic man of action like Washington should stand out before the public mind as either divine or priggish is indeed to be lamented; but it is doubtful if Professor Trent has succeeded in humanizing, although he may have masculated his subject. Like Mr. Ford, who flatly tells us that Washington could veer from the simple line of truth, and ends his book by asserting that he admires the real George Washington more than ever before; or like Woodrow Wilson, who begins his volume with a picture of an actual young Virginian with human passions and earthly impulses, and ends with a portrait of a saintly old man, of whom he speaks in charmed words with a far-away and mystical rhythm—so Professor Trent begins with the sturdy purpose of cool criticism, but soon falls under the spell of his own spirit of reverence and does its bidding. Probably the real George Washington is now less real than the ideal: the traditional George Washington has become a reality.

Jefferson, to whom the second lecture is devoted, needs to be rescued from his friends almost as much as Washington. His name is bandied about by political orators, who cover him, almost beyond recognition, with the foolish blandishments of rhetoric. On the other hand, federalistic historians have wholly failed to appreciate his genius. As a consequence the real Jefferson is little known. Professor Trent has done something in a brief lecture to show us the founder of the democratic party in proper light and perspective.

In some respects the chapter on Calhoun is the least satisfactory, although the subject is treated with great fairness and with a certain breadth and freedom. Nowhere can be found a better portrayal of the typical planter of the old *régime*, for whose necessities Calhoun invented his intricate dialectic subtleties:

All he wanted was to be let alone; but if he were not let alone, he would peaceably withdraw from a partnership made for him by his ancestors, when times were better than now; if any one tried to stop him he would fight.

But when the author treats of Calhoun's constitutional theories he seems at times to go astray and to fail to appreciate the fundamental doctrine of the great leader. He warns the reader of Calhoun's works that it

is not safe to approach these books unless he has thoroughly disabused his mind of the notion that sovereignty can be divided and a government founded on compact. If one starts with these notions in one's head, the sure grip of Calhoun's logic will end by making one a nullifier or a lunatic, it matters little which (p. 191).

One might well wonder how the person innocent of the lore of political philosophy could better prepare himself to be gripped by the logic of the honest nullifier than by following Professor Trent's advice; for surely the cunning argumentative snares are set in vain for the man who believes that sovereignty is divisible and a government can be based on agreement. In fact, he who believes that Calhoun's philosophical principles were sound and agrees with him in considering sovereignty a unit needs warning; for he can escape nullification or the madhouse only by seeing that the great Southern logician made false historical assumptions and could quote the scriptures of history to his purpose.

Of the seven statesmen whose lives are sketched in this volume, the first two belong to the nation; Jefferson was scarcely less of an American than Washington, and the two were in large measure free from the limitations of a narrow environment. The other five, Randolph, Calhoun, Toombs, Stephens and Davis are typical Southerners, whose manners and ideas illustrate the course of Southern history and the development of the pro-slavery spirit. Professor Trent has written an interesting and helpful book; but perhaps it is not too much to hope that he will sometime give us a more complete study of slavery as it showed itself in politics and statesmanship.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN.

Nicaragua: War of the Filibusters. By Judge DANIEL B. LUCAS, late President of the Supreme Court of Appeals of West Virginia, with introductory chapter by Hon. LEWIS BAKER, United States Minister to Central America; *The Nicaragua Canal*, by Hon. W. A. McCORKLE, Governor of West Virginia; *The Monroe Doctrine*, by J. FAIRFAX McLAUGHLIN, LL.D. Richmond, Va., B. F. Johnson Publishing Company, 1896. — 216 pp.

Such is the titlepage of a volume the various contents of which relate chiefly to Nicaragua. The part contributed by Judge Lucas, which forms about half of the book, possesses a certain historical interest, though it can scarcely be said to add anything to our knowledge of its subject — the filibustering expeditions of William Walker. Perhaps a better commentary could not be written on Walker, whom Judge Lucas calls "this Central American John Brown," than that which is furnished by Mr. Baker's introduction. On the 1st of May, 1896, Mr. Baker was awakened at San José, Costa Rica, by the firing of cannon and the noise of a brass band.